

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Petition*

1. The Petition to re-send Final Office action under 37 C.F.R. § 1.181 filed on 22 December 2009 was granted on 23 March 2010. As such, a new Final Office action is provided with a new statutory period for reply.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The claim recites "an organo-resistive material ohmically coupled to the electrolyte", which is not enabled by the specification. In fact, the specification teaches that the electrolyte is not ohmically coupled to the organo-resistive material since this device does not follow Ohm's law ( $V=IR$ ). See, for example, Ruzyllo (Semiconductor Glossary, entry for "ohmic contact") which teaches that an ohmic coupling has resistance that is independent of applied voltage (as set forth in Ohm's law). Rather, the specification clearly teaches that "the resistance (and with it the conductivity) is in this case altered by several orders of magnitude" (Page 2, Lines 19-20) and

Art Unit: 2891

more specifically teaches "applying an electrical voltage between 2 and 3 initiates an ionic current through 4, whereby organo-resistive material 2 is either oxidized or reduced and is thus rendered conductive or non-conductive" (Page 5, Lines 8-11). The specification specifically teaches that the organo-resistive material is not ohmically coupled to the electrolyte but rather the resistance (conductivity) changes as a result of the voltage applied. This non-ohmic behavior is the critical feature of the disclosed device. As such, the recitation of "an organo-resistive material ohmically coupled to the electrolyte" is not enabled by the disclosure.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims each recite "an organo-resistive material ohmically coupled to the electrolyte". However, the specification teaches that the electrolyte is not ohmically coupled to the organo-resistive material since this device does not follow Ohm's law ( $V=IR$ ). Rather, the specification clearly teaches that "the resistance (and with it the conductivity) is in this case altered by several orders of magnitude" (Page 2, Lines 19-20) and more specifically teaches "applying an electrical voltage between 2 and 3 initiates an ionic current through 4, whereby organo-resistive material 2 is either oxidized or reduced and is thus rendered conductive or non-

Art Unit: 2891

conductive" (Page 5, Lines 8-11). The specification specifically teaches that the organo-resistive material is not ohmically coupled to the electrolyte but rather the resistance (conductivity) changes as a result of the voltage applied. As such, the recitation of "an organo-resistive material ohmically coupled to the electrolyte" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear how the organo-resistive material can be ohmically coupled to the electrolyte.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claim interpretations: The Examiner notes that a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. See, e.g., *In re Pearson*, 181 USPQ 641 (CCPA); *In re Minks*, 169 USPQ 120 (Bd Appeals); *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). See MPEP §2114. The recitation of “memory unit having a storage function” does not distinguish the present invention over the prior art, each of which teach the structure as claimed (full explanation to

Art Unit: 2891

follow). Nevertheless, the devices of the prior art are memory devices with storage function as described below.

The examiner notes that a claim containing a "recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus" if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987) See MPEP § 2114. Furthermore, while features of an apparatus may be recited either structurally or functionally, claims directed to an apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function. *In re Schreiber*, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477-78, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431-32 (Fed. Cir. 1997). See MPEP § 2112.01. The recitations of "wherein the storage function of the unit results from the organo-resistive material being embedded in the electrolyte" (in claims 1 and 13), "so that the flow of ionic current through the electrolyte due to application of a voltage to the conductive material causes a readable change in at least one of the conductance or color of the organo-resistive material" (in claim 2), and "wherein a voltage applied to the conductor causes a readable change in the color of the organo-resistive material in response to the flow of ionic current through the electrolyte upon said application of the voltage" (in claim 25) are intended use language which do not differentiate the claimed device from the prior art, who teaches the structure of the claims as described below.

- a. Claims 1-4, 6-7, 9, 12-13 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Roth (Languir, Vol. 18; supplied to Applicant with Office action dated 19 September 2008).

Art Unit: 2891

The claims merely describe a notoriously well-known voltammetry device and is disclosed by Roth, who teaches a memory unit having a storage function composed substantially of organic material comprising: an electrolyte ("Electrolyte A" or "Electrolyte B" as described "Chemicals and Materials on Page 4031) and an organo-resistive material ( $C_{12}Fc$ , PM1, PM3 as described throughout the article) embedded in the electrolyte (see Page 4032, specifically Left Col., Lines 7-9 and Right Col., Lines 3-5 and Figure 1 describing that  $C_{12}Fc$ , PM1, PM3 are applied on a working electrode and then immersed in electrolyte, which is embedding the organo-resistive material into the electrolyte) to form the memory unit. The organo-resistive material of PM1 and PM3 have conjugated chains (see Figure 2, for example). The organo-resistive material is disposed in structured form (as a SAM - self assembled monolayer, see Page 4031-4032) on a substrate (a glass slide, see Page 4032). The organic-resistive material is also soluble for processing (see "Gold Ball Electrode" section on page 4032 which explains that  $C_{12}Fc$ , PM1, PM3 are soluble). The memory unit further includes a conductive electrode material (counter electrode, see Page 4032 and Figure 1) which is separated from the organo-resistive material by the electrolyte.

Regarding claim 7, Roth teaches a method of making the memory unit ohmically coupled "a first circuit" between a ground and supply voltage (see Figure 2 and associated text, for example) and also include the aforementioned organo-resistive material and electrolyte, as well as a resistor (see R1, for example, in Figure 2).

See treatments of functional language above under "claim interpretations".

Art Unit: 2891

b. Claims 1-4, 6-7, 9, 12-13 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Roth (J. Vac. Sci. Technol. B, Vol. 18; supplied to Applicant with Office action dated 19 September 2008).

The claims merely describe a notoriously well-known voltammetry device and is disclosed by Roth, who teaches a memory unit having a storage function composed substantially of organic material comprising: an electrolyte (distilled  $\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$  containing 0.1 M  $\text{Bu}_4\text{NPF}_6$  in II. Experiment and Figure 2 caption) and an organo-resistive material (PM0, PM1, PM2, PM3 as describe in Figure 1, for example) embedded in the electrolyte (see Page 2360 II. Experiment, Lines 12-16 and Figure 2 caption) to form the memory unit. The organo-resistive material of PM0, PM1, PM2, a band PM3 have conjugated chains (see Figure 1, for example). The organo-resistive material is disposed in structured form (as a SAM - self assembled monolayer, see II. Experiment) on a substrate (soft glass, II. Experiment). The organic-resistive material is also soluble for processing (see II. Experiment section which explains that the SAM is processed in solution and is soluble). The memory unit further includes a conductive electrode material (Ag counter electrode, see Figure 2 caption) which is separated from the organo-resistive material by the electrolyte.

Regarding claim 7, Roth teaches a method of making the memory unit ohmically coupled (since they are in electrical contact, as noted by Applicant – see Remarks Page 6) to a first circuit between a ground and supply voltage (see Figure 2 and associated text, for example) and also including the aforementioned organo-resistive material and electrolyte, as well as a resistor (see R1, for example, in Figure 2).

Art Unit: 2891

See treatments of functional language above under "claim interpretations".

c. Claims 1-6, 9-14 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sakurai ('879).

The claims merely describe a notoriously well-known organic electrochemical device and is disclosed by Sakurai, who teaches a memory unit having a storage function composed substantially of organic material comprising: an electrolyte (Element 3, Figs. 5-6; Col. 17, Lines 43-44 and Col. 18, Lines 44-45) and an organo-resistive material of polypyrrole, for example (Elements 13 or 14, Figs. 5-6; Col. 17, Lines 53-55 and Col. 18, Lines 46-49) embedded in the electrolyte (see Figs. 5-6), to form the memory unit. The electrolyte is aqueous (Col. 17, Lines 43-44 and Col. 18, Lines 44-45). The organo-resistive material of polypyrrole has conjugated chains. The organo-resistive material is disposed in structured form (see Elements 13 or 14, for example) on a substrate of Nesa glass (Element 1; Col. 17, Lines 39-40 and Col. 18, Line 42). The organic-resistive material of polypyrrole is also soluble for processing (material is dissolved during dendrite formation processes). The memory unit further includes a conductive electrode material (Element 4) which is separated from the organo-resistive material by the electrolyte (Figs. 5-6).

Regarding the indefinite recitation of "ohmically coupled" claim 25, Sakurai must meet this recitation since the structure of the organo-resistive material is embedded in the electrolyte as claimed.

See treatments of functional language above under "claim interpretations".

d. Claims 1-14 and 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Misra ('270).

The claims merely describe a notoriously well-known redox device and is disclosed by Misra, who teaches a memory unit having a storage function composed substantially of organic material comprising: an electrolyte (Element 170; Col. 7, Lines 35-57) and an organo-resistive material (Element 120 is PANI, same material disclosed by Applicant, see Col. 4, Lines 35-38) embedded in the electrolyte (see Figs 4A and 4B shows Element 120 embedded in Element 170), to form the memory unit. The electrolyte can be water-based or solid (Col. 7, Lines 53-56). The organo-resistive material of PANI has conjugated chains. The organo-resistive material is disposed in structured form on a substrate (Element 300, for example). The organo-resistive material of PANI is soluble. The memory unit further includes a conductive electrode material (Element 110) which is separated from the organo-resistive material by the electrolyte (see Figs. 4A and 4B).

Regarding claim 7, Misra teaches a method of making the memory unit ohmically coupled to a first circuit between a ground and supply voltage (see Col. 7, Lines 63-66, for example) and also include the aforementioned organo-resistive material and electrolyte, as well as a resistor, which is another memory device in an array (Fig. 1 and Col. 5, Lines 8-11, for example). Each memory in the array has a given storage density value, and by forming an array, further storage density value higher than the given value results since there are more than one memory units. Further, since each memory unit in the array contains another organo-resistive component, the other memory unit is the

Art Unit: 2891

electronic organic component of claim 23 which has the same organic material as the original organo-resistive material (Col. 5, Lines 8-11, for example).

Regarding the indefinite recitation of "ohmically coupled" claims 23 and 25, Misra must meet this recitation since the structure of the organo-resistive material is embedded in the electrolyte as claimed.

See treatments of functional language above under "claim interpretations".

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 5, 10-11, 14 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roth (J. Vac. Sci. Technol. B, Vol. 18; supplied to Applicant with Office action dated 19 September 2008).

Regarding claims 5, 10-11 and 14, Roth teaches the memory unit of claims 1, 3 and 4 wherein the organic-resistive material is also soluble for processing (see II. Experiment section which explains that the SAM is processed in solution and is soluble). However, the device uses a solvent electrolyte of  $\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$  (see II. Experiment). However, Roth also suggests building a device with a solid electrolyte (IV. Outlook, Right Col., Lines 25-27). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a solid

Art Unit: 2891

electrolyte since Roth suggests building such a device to explore the properties thereof (IV. Outlook, Right Col., Lines 25-27).

Regarding claims 23 and 24, Roth does not explicitly teach using many of the memory units in an array, but suggests that a miniaturized the memory unit would be useful in high density arrays of memory (Page 2359, Right Col. and IV Outlook point (1) on Page 2363, Left Col.). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the disclosed memory cells of Roth in an array of duplicate cells to produce the high density memory array as suggest by Roth (Page 2359, Right Col. and IV Outlook point (1) on Page 2363, Left Col.). It has been held that the mere duplication of parts has no patentable significance unless a new and unexpected result is produced. *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960). See MPEP § 2144.04 VI-B. Additionally, since each memory unit includes the aforementioned organo-resistive material and electrolyte, the resistor is merely another memory device in an array. Each memory in the array has a given storage density value, and by forming an array, further storage density value higher than the given value results since there are more than one memory units. Further, since each memory unit in the array contains another organo-resistive component, the other memory unit is the electronic organic component of claim 23 which has the same organic material as the original organo-resistive material.

10. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roth (J. Vac. Sci. Technol. B, Vol. 18; supplied to Applicant with Office action dated 19 September 2008) in view of Beckman ('536).

Art Unit: 2891

Roth teaches that the memory unit is measured by voltammetry with a voltage drop, but does not teach the conventional details of the circuit, except for the voltage drop between the working and counter electrodes (III. Results and Discussion).

However, Beckman teaches a conventional electrochemical cell (Element 1) ohmically coupled to a first circuit (See Figs. 1 and 2) with the working electrode (Element 2) and counter electrode (Element 4) "ohmically coupled" between ground (on side of Element 4) and a voltage supply (on side of Element 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to place the memory unit between a supply voltage and a ground potential in order to establish the required voltage potential across the working and counter electrodes.

Roth does not explicitly teach using many of the memory units in an array, but suggests that a miniaturized the memory unit would be useful in high density arrays of memory (Page 2359, Right Col. and IV Outlook point (1) on Page 2363, Left Col.). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the disclosed memory cells of Roth in an array of duplicate cells to produce the high density memory array as suggest by Roth (Page 2359, Right Col. and IV Outlook point (1) on Page 2363, Left Col.). It has been held that the mere duplication of parts has no patentable significance unless a new and unexpected result is produced. *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960). See MPEP § 2144.04 VI-B. Additionally, since each memory unit includes the aforementioned organo-resistive material and electrolyte, the resistor is merely another memory device in an array. Each memory in the array has a given storage density value, and by forming an array, further storage density value higher than the given value results since there are more

Art Unit: 2891

than one memory units. Further, since each memory unit in the array contains another organo-resistive component, the other memory unit is the electronic organic component of claim 23 which has the same organic material as the original organo-resistive material.

### ***Response to Arguments***

11. Applicant's arguments filed 19 March 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

12. Regarding Applicant's traversal of the rejection of claims 23 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph and 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph:

The Applicant argues that "ohmically coupled" means connected electrically directly. This is not correct. The term "ohmically coupled" has a specific meaning and does not mean "connected electrically directly". See, for example, Ruzylo (Semiconductor Glossary, entry for "ohmic contact") which teaches that an ohmic coupling has resistance that is independent of applied voltage (as set forth in Ohm's law). Electrically connecting two elements together does not inherently result in them being "ohmically coupled", but instead can form, for example, a Schottky contact, which is non-ohmic. Furthermore, the Applicant's own specification directly contradicts that the organo-resistive material is ohmically coupled to the electrolyte. Rather, the specification clearly teaches that the organo-resistive material is not ohmically coupled to the electrolyte but rather the resistance (conductivity) changes as a result of the voltage applied. See the statements of "the resistance (and with it the conductivity) is in this case altered by several orders of magnitude" (Page 2, Lines 19-20) and more specifically "applying an electrical voltage

Art Unit: 2891

between 2 and 3 initiates an ionic current through 4, whereby organo-resistive material 2 is either oxidized or reduced and is thus rendered conductive or non-conductive" (Page 5, Lines 8-11).

As such, the rejections of claims 23 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph and 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph are proper and maintained.

13. Regarding Applicant's traversal of the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-7, 9, 12-13 and 25-26 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Roth (Languir, Vol. 18; *supplied to Applicant with Office action dated 19 September 2008*) and rejections under 103(a) citing Roth:

The Applicant argues that Roth does not teach "an organo-resistive material embedded in the electrolyte to form the memory unit". Applicant argues that Roth teaches a self-assembled monolayer formed on the surface of an electrode which is immersed in the electrolyte. This is not persuasive for the following reasons. As the Office action points out the self-assembled monolayer (SAM) is the organo-resistive material. The self-assembled monolayer (which is the organo-resistive material) is on an electrode 2000 Angstroms high, with a PDMS well enclosing the SAM covered electrode and embedded in the electrolyte (see Section Band Electrodes on Page 4032, for example or Lines 1-9 of Right Col., on Page 4032). The relevant portions of the reference reads "All potentials are versus Ag/Ag<sup>+</sup> and recorded in dried, distilled CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> containing 0.1 M Bu<sub>4</sub>NPF<sub>6</sub>" (see last three lines of Page 2360, Left Col.) and "the PM0 SAM on a 25 μm diam Au electro in a thin film of an electrolyte solution containing 0.10 M Bu<sub>4</sub>NPF<sub>6</sub> in dried, distilled CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>" (see caption of Figure 2). Applicant's citation of the passage of Page 4032, Left Col., Lines 3-7 (see Remarks Page 8, Lines 14-15) is not relevant to the rejection as set forth because this passage is about forming the self-assembled monolayer (which is the

Art Unit: 2891

organo-resistive material) on an electrode. The Applicant's argument that Roth does not expose the organo-resistive material and that "since Roth-Langmuir places an electrode in a solution including an organo-resistive material to form a self-assembled monolayer on the surface of the electrode, and then exposes the electrode to an electrolyte solution, Roth has no 'organo-resistive material embedded in the electrolyte to form the memory unit'.". This is incorrect. As already noted, the self-assembled monolayer (SAM) is the organo-resistive material and since the electrode has the SAM thereon when exposed to the electrolyte. Therefore, Roth clearly teaches the claimed invention.

14. Regarding Applicant's traversal of the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-7, 9, 12-13 and 25-26 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Roth (J. Vac. Sci. Technol. B, Vol. 18; *supplied to Applicant with Office action dated 19 September 2008*) and rejections under 103(a) citing Roth and Beckmann ('536):

The Applicant argues that Roth does not teach "an organo-resistive material embedded in the electrolyte to form the memory unit". Applicant points to Page 2360, Left Col., Lines 7-11 of Section II, Experiment for support. This is not persuasive for the following reasons. The examiner notes that the Applicant's citation of Page 2360, Left Col., Lines 7-11 of Section II, Experiment is not relevant to the rejection. As the Office action points out the organo-resistive material is indeed embedded in the electrolyte. The relevant portions of the reference reads "All potentials are versus Ag/Ag<sup>+</sup> and recorded in dried, distilled CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> containing 0.1 M Bu<sub>4</sub>NPF<sub>6</sub>" (see last three lines of Page 2360, Left Col.) and "the PM0 SAM on a 25 μm diam Au electro in a thin film of an electrolyte solution containing 0.10 M Bu<sub>4</sub>NPF<sub>6</sub> in dried, distilled CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>" (see

Art Unit: 2891

caption of Figure 2). Applicant's citation of this very passage (see Remarks Page 10, Lines 3-5) confirms that Roth meets the claim by teaching the organo-resistive material embedded in the electrolyte. In addition, Applicant's argument regarding the microelectrode being removed and citation of Page 2360, Left Col., Lines 11-12 of Section II, Experiment is also irrelevant to the rejection because it is about forming the organo-resistive material on an electrode.

15. Regarding Applicant's traversal of the rejection of claims 1-6, 9-14 and 25-26 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Sakurai ('879):

The Applicant argues that Sakurai does not teach an organo-resistive material embedded in the electrolyte to form the memory unit and cites Col. 17, Lines 38-43. The Applicant further argues that Sakurai teaches that the device is used as a solar cell and not used as a memory unit. This is not persuasive. The Applicant's position relies upon a different use for the claimed device than the prior art intends to use the device for. In response the Examiner notes that a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. See, e.g., *In re Pearson*, 181 USPQ 641 (CCPA); *In re Minks*, 169 USPQ 120 (Bd Appeals); *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). See MPEP § 2114. As pointed out by the Office action, the prior art of Sakurai teaches all of the limitations of the claim and therefore teaches a structural that is identical to the claimed invention. Where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a *prima facie* case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established.

Art Unit: 2891

*In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). See MPEP § 2112.01. The manner of operating the device does not differentiate the apparatus claim from the prior art. See MPEP § 2114.

The Applicant also argues that the dendritic structure (Element 13) is not an organo-resistive material (see Remarks Page 11, Lines 7-13) and cites Col. 17, Lines 43-47 for support of this argument. However, this citation actually states that the polypyrrole has dendritic structures. In other words, the dendrites are polypyrrole (see also Col. 17, Lines 53-55 which reads "when a section of the resultant polypyrrole film 2 was observed with a TEM dendritic structures 13 of a few  $\mu\text{m}$  high were found"), which is the organo-resistive material (the examiner notes that the Applicant's own specification teaches that polypyrrole is an organo-resistive material - see Page 3, Line 19). As such, the Applicant's arguments are in direct contradiction to the teachings of the Applicant's own specification and are not convincing.

The Applicant also argues that the pyramidal projections (Element 14) is not an organo-resistive material (see Remarks Page 11, Lines 14-21) and cites Col. 18, Lines 45-49 for support of this argument. However, this citation actually states that the polypyrrole has pyramidal projections. In other words, the pyramidal projections are polypyrrole, which is the organo-resistive material (the examiner notes that the Applicant's own specification teaches that polypyrrole is an organo-resistive material - see Page 3, Line 19). As such, the Applicant's arguments are in direct contradiction to the teachings of the Applicant's own specification and are not convincing.

Art Unit: 2891

16. Regarding Applicant's traversal of the rejection of claims 1-14 and 23-26 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Misra ('270):

The Applicant argues that Sakurai does not teach an organo-resistive material embedded in the electrolyte to form the memory unit and argues that Misra teaches that the device is used as a crossbar array and not used as a memory unit. This is not persuasive. The Applicant's position relies upon a different use for the claimed device than the prior art intends to use the device for. In response the Examiner notes that a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. See, e.g., *In re Pearson*, 181 USPQ 641 (CCPA); *In re Minks*, 169 USPQ 120 (Bd Appeals); *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). See MPEP § 2114. As pointed out by the Office action, the prior art of Misra teaches all of the limitations of the claim and therefore teaches a structural that is identical to the claimed invention. Where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a *prima facie* case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established. *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). See MPEP § 2112.01. The manner of operating the device does not differentiate the apparatus claim from the prior art. See MPEP § 2114.

The Applicant also argues that Misra mentions no organo-resistive material and cites Col. 4, Lines 36-38 arguing that PANI is not an organo-resistive material. However, the examiner notes that this citation, including the PANI material, actually supports that Misra teaches the organo-resistive material because the Applicant's own specification teaches that PANI is an

Art Unit: 2891

organo-resistive material (see Specification Page 3, Line 18). As such, the Applicant's arguments are in direct contradiction to the teachings of the Applicant's own specification and are not convincing.

### ***Conclusion***

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Wrighton ('673) discloses an electrolyte (Element 18, at least) and an organo-resistive material (Element 16, at least) embedded in the electrolyte having conductance and color changes.

18. Applicant's amendment to claim 7 necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2891

***Contact Information***

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MATTHEW W. SUCH whose telephone number is (571)272-8895. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9AM-5PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kiesha Bryant can be reached on (571) 272-1844. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Matthew W. Such/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2891